DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 629 HE 033 804

AUTHOR	Ferrara, F. Felicia
TITLE	Faculty Management: Maximizing Autonomy and Job Satisfaction under Economic, Administrative and Technological Changes.
PUB DATE	1998-04-00
NOTE	14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Popular Culture Association (28th) and the Annual Conference of the American Culture Association (20th, Orlando, FL, April 8-11, 1998).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Educational Change; Higher Education; *Job Satisfaction; *Personnel Management; *Professional Autonomy; Professional Development; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper considers and summarizes information about the current state of autonomy and job satisfaction within U.S. institutions of higher education. First, the forces that often obscure, or lessen, the traditionally autonomous faculty member's sense of job satisfaction are discussed. Then, potentially overwhelming technological changes that contribute to the diminishing sense of an autonomous work setting and job satisfaction are reviewed. Recommendations are also made for professional development programs that may help faculty deal with today's fact paced changes in academia. Autonomy was traditionally seen as an inherent benefit or privilege extended to worthy faculty members, so administrative innovations that modify or jeopardize the faculty member's perceived autonomy on the job have resulted in reduced morale and overall job dissatisfaction. Constrained budgets and fast paced technological change mean that the faculty member of the future will find a very different field. Recommendations are given for educational policy affecting: (1) autonomy and belonging; (2) hiring and tenure; and (3) technological training needs. (Contains 49 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running Head: FACULTY MANAGEMENT

ED 450 629

Faculty Management:

Maximizing Autonomy and Job Satisfaction Under

Economic, Administrative and Technological Changes

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

by

F. Felicia Ferrara

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. Ferrara
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2A

University of Sarasota

Paper presented at the twenty-eighth Popular Culture Association and Twentieth American Culture Association Annual Conference, April 8-11, 1998 Orlando, FL.

HE033804

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Autonomy in Academia

Autonomy is a long-standing revered attribute inherent to the position of the professorship. Faculty, particularly those involved in the scholarly pursuit of the 60's and 70's, may readily agree that it was often the privilege of autonomy and freedom of expression that inspired them to pursue, at times, controversial scholarly research. However, in more recent times, funding reductions, accountability issues, and overall policy changes have challenged, reproached, and in some universities, all but ameliorated any prospect of professional autonomy. Consequently, many academians reported reduced moral and overall job dissatisfaction throughout the 80's and 90's, with the outlook dimming even more as competing forces may adversely impact the infrastructure of higher education, in preparation for the 21st century.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate and summarize the current state of autonomy and job satisfaction within the U.S. institutions of higher education. First, a discussion concerning the imposing forces that often obscure, if not ameliorate, the traditionally autonomous faculty member's sense of job satisfaction will be provided. Second, potentially overwhelming technological changes that contribute to the diminishing sense of an autonomous work-setting and job satisfaction will be reviewed. Finally, recommendations for professional development programs that may help faculty deal with the fast paced changes in academia will be presented.

For some faculty, who have encountered the newly invoked restrictions on autonomy, an overall low moral and disinterested pursuit of self-improvement and scholarly endeavors has evolved. For instance, whereas a scholarly research topic may have been pursued for the benefit of relevant scientific discovery under the protection of autonomy, often shielded by tenure, the impetus for investigative works may now be sheer job survival. Thus, driving forces of what topic and how to proceed with research may now be economically driven rather than theoretically driven as previously espoused in scientific circles. For the novice as well as for the seasoned faculty member, autonomy is now a jeopardized job benefit. What was once a valued career incentive, may now be a source of perpetual job dissatisfaction.

Unfortunately, autonomy known to previous professors regarding personal management of teaching, research, and service in a designated academic discipline may indeed be, at the least, stifled. In a study by the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Technology (1992), it was noted that professors are increasingly alienated from their institution and somewhat demoralized. Two-thirds of a recent poll describes faculty morale as fair or poor, and 60% had negative feelings and sense of community at their institution (Altbach, 1995).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction in any employment setting is highly associated with job performance and product output. In private industry, product output is associated with commodities or services of the production environment, while in the university or college setting, product output is equated with student by-products of the learning environment. Tangible indexes of such products include grade point averages or student initiated research projects. It therefore follows, that enhancement of faculty's sense of job satisfaction, even if it means revitalizing autonomy, may enhance student learning and the quality of student projects.

Pollicino (1996) examined job satisfaction within the university setting on data acquired from the National Survey Postsecondary Faculty, 1988. It was concluded that job satisfaction among university professors was a complex concept, but definitely requires congruence between the mission statement of the institution and the individual faculty member's goals and values. In addition to autonomy, Pollicino noted that collegiality and workloads were valued factors contributing to faculty's sense of job satisfaction.

Economic trends and funding restrictions also play a role in the amount of autonomy afforded the tenured or non-tenured faculty member. As the pressure to conservatively manage institutional spending continues to plaque administrators and budget cuts force trimming of existing fiscal expenditures, faculty positions have become a prime target and easy prey for budgetary sacrifice. High-end salaries of tenured professors, cries for accountability, and demands for prudent fiscal management, have all impacted autonomy and job satisfaction of the professorship.

Further complications ensue if one considers the ramifications of the technological revolution, as technology in and of itself, represents a need for enhanced but often remiss faculty support services, and the forces toward job

dissatisfaction multiply. Most often, overzealous innovative programs are initiated by legislation or administrative policy makers, while deficits exist in the resources needed to fulfill program requirements. Essentials like high-powered computer hardware, software, and technical training programs often lag behind the proposed program initiative resulting in a frustrated workforce. It is not surprising to think that the faculty member of the pre-21st century, tenured or not, faces tremendous pressures as progressive practices change academic arenas at unprecedented speeds.

Pressures arising from overpowering budget constraints, on one hand, may lead to fear of job security, pay freezes, department closures and so on. Whereas, on the other hand, increasing technologically-oriented workload demands often require teaching a global student body, increased time at a computer terminal, and an unprecedented manner of time and skill management. Professional development programs are not always available for new software or hardware products as time allotment and budgetary constraints prohibit the professor from gaining skills elsewhere with the hopes of institutional reimbursement.

Historical Perspectives

Autonomy was an inherent part of the professorship in the U.S. since the beginning of higher education in this country. For the most part, it related to terms of how as well as what research endeavors to pursue, allowing the professor to explore, question, and discover topics of concern without fear of censorship. However, recent societal trends emphasizing accountability (McPherson, 1994) and faculty maintenance of detailed records as to daily task productivity and workloads (Layzell, 1992) have forced their way to the forefront. Thereby, socio-economic demands further erode the traditional meaning of autonomy, an honor formerly bestowed upon worthy faculty.

During earlier, more fiscally enriched times, autonomy within the professorship represented academic freedom and sense of relatedness or association with the institutional mission (Pock, 1996; Virginia Commission of the University of the Twenty-first Century, 1989). Faculty members, within a boundary of institutional requirements, were free to shape the professorship in terms of persona, course delivery, student communications, and overall job responsibilities. However, more recent concerns toward autonomy include, reductions of institutional autonomy (Wachman, 1994), reaffirmation of the principles of autonomy (University Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization), faculty rights (Leas, 1991), research topic selection (Wood, 1990), and need for changes (Virginia Commission of the University of the Twenty-First Century, (1989).

Demands for accountability. Faculty may now be required to maintain records as to daily productivity schedules as well as ancillary activities conducted on behalf of students and the institution (Layzell, 1992). Student-faculty ratios, research projects, professional development reimbursement and fiscal expenditures are closely monitored. Unfortunately, although accountability may address product outcomes such as student test scores and student publications, it does not begin to assess research quality and teaching quality. Hence, the previously revered academic autonomy succumbs once more to fiscal pressures. Accountability now forces the use of quantifying measures of teaching, research, and service as inherent parts of the faculty evaluation process, perhaps to the point of being remiss about scholarly review of research and program outcomes (Centra, 1996; McPherson, 1994).

Similarly, faculty that may have formerly participated in department-wide decisions such as class size, course content, scheduling and so on, may now be relieved of that task as administrators fall prey to external pressures and plan, often single-handedly, to meet fiscal pressures and competitive demands (Altbach, 1995). For example, to accommodate accountability at Boise State University, it was proposed that student evaluation be made public. In one university community, administrative mandates specified that exams be given in all classes, faculty must attend all classes, a no-cheating pledge must be delivered in all classes, and faculty was expected to monitor students who skip class. Course requirements, on the other hand, can be set by the faculty member, often in collaboration with a standard of the department (Raelin, 1986). Not surprisingly, faculties have expressed concern about a need for increased levels of control over the daily activities of the professorship. To many, it is viewed as a time of reduced power and restricted autonomy of the professorship (Altbach, 1995).

Societal Trends Toward Higher Education

Societal trends have greatly influenced the shaping of the United States institution of higher education as we know it today. Prior to the turn of the century, the Land Grant Acts of the 1860's allowed for, or highly encouraged, the development of higher education facilities, complete with emphasis on service and research (Altbach, 1995). At that

time, many doctoral level professors were educated abroad, namely Germany. Since that time, the U.S. academic model emphasized easy access to public universities and ellaborative efforts toward collaborative educational programs and exchanges. So much so, that it was often idealized as an institutional accomplishment to numerous countries throughout the world. An academia degree was both revered and envied by society as a whole, in part, because during the early turn of the century only the wealthy or elite dared to pursue an advanced degree in any discipline of academia, and even then, most college seats were reserved for males.

Then, World War II diversely impacted society as a whole as well as educational attainment. Due to the magnitude of the war, males and females alike were briskly drafted into the military, each of whom, benefited from the passage of the GI bill. Educational classes across the nation filled with newly aspiring college-bound military releasees. During this tremendous growth period in higher education, university administrators embraced the concept of freedom of speech and scholarly autonomy, all falling under the auspices of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. With governmental backing, higher education prospered. Individual states held the ultimate responsibility for administering and maintaining the vast scholarly empires that were now forming the foundation for cultivating a new breed of human resources, the academic scholar.

Government funding supported the flourishing world of academia by supplying financial aid for students, federal funding, grants, and student loan programs. Other executive and administrative supplements were allocated as deemed necessary for the successful growth of the infrastructure of American higher education. Autonomy was a major thread in the development of the professorship at that time.

As may be expected when dealing with any multidimensional society, a barrage of ongoing legislative mandates and constituency demands further impacted the development of higher education. Affirmative Action, accountability, and student demands grew from the unrest of the 60's. Societal demands called out for social justice in all situations, including higher education. Although the philosophical mission of the professorship during the 60's yelled out for academic freedom and autonomy in scholarly pursuit, economic and monetary concerns of the 80's and 90's distorted priorities resulting in the de-emphasis of scholarly pursuit (Mooney, 1992). The major recession of the 80's severely curtailed federal funding, grant programs, and many governmentally subsidized programs in higher education. Simultaneously, escalating costs of maintaining institutions of higher education forced budgetary concerns to the forefront. Faculty budgets fell under major scrutiny. Many professors hired during the 70's and 80's were now tenured and earning a high-end salary, for what seemed too many, as a cushioned job.

Accountability. Along with the floods of financial constraints came the cries for increased accountability and accusations of campus unproductivity, which consequently forced many institutions to drastically modify administrative plans and policies. Emphasis was now placed on cutting budget line-items and increased accountability. Institutional managers were now compelled to review cost cutting strategies including, a review of hiring policies, tenure systems, department closures, and program mergers. The overall dilemma encompassed, the previously unheard of, downsizing of the American university system.

Autonomy, often recognized by the award of tenure to advanced scholars, was now replaced with emphasis on cost-effectiveness in institutional management of colleges and departments within the college. Academic values have apparently shifted from appreciation of autonomously achieved academic scholarly works to that of forming essential functions to meet the overbearing forces of reduced funding. The formerly revered scholarly professor may now be readily replaced by the adjunct or part-time instructor for a third or fourth of the salary allotted for the full-time faculty member. While the use of adjunct faculty or even teaching assistants is reported at 50% in many research institutes, it often escalates to 70 to 80% at the community college level.

Faculty productivity. Faculty productivity has been questioned (Boer, 1990; Massy & Zemsky, 1992; Mooney, 1991). Many academic policy makers agree to place more emphasis on teaching, further stating that research is over valued, particularly under recent budget cuts and department downsizing. Productivity and workload studies have emerged across several campuses in Massachusetts, Nevada, New York, Arizona, and Wisconsin, whereas, Hawaii and Florida mandate a minimum teaching load in state subsidized universities of 12 hours of instruction (Levine & Nidiffer, 1993).

While extensive professional development and grant monies are allocated toward research, only a few research findings may contribute significantly to scholarly endeavors. The Carnegie Foundation for Higher Education (1992)

noted that 61% of faculty in research universities report publishing six or more journal articles in the past three years, as compared to 31% of faculty working elsewhere (Boyer, Altbach, & Whitelaw, 1994). However, external funding for research has declined and competition for resources is, in most fields, overwhelming. More emphasis is placed on applied research in connection with the private sectors, hence the nature of research has changed, to accommodate more basic applied needs of the society. Furthermore, with global competition for students, emphasis will be placed on the student as a customer rather than as traditionally perceived as a protégé of scholarly investigation.

Finances, promotion, and tenure. Tenure, which was thought of as a privilege bestowed upon an accomplished professor to enhance autonomy is now under scrutiny in terms of (a) evaluation of tenured faculty, (b) hiring non-tenured faculty, (c) definition of tenure, and (d) the plight for alternate solutions to tenure. Financial cutbacks impacted faculty salaries drastically. For instance, Massachusetts and California experienced faculty salary cuts, while New York and Maryland froze salaries as needed. Similarly, given the large size of faculty membership in some universities reaching as much as 1000, and as many as 50 in one department, a sense of detachment and non-belonging emerges, which in turn reduces moral (Tierney, 1998). Similarly, the hiring frenzy found on many campuses is said to result in extended use of adjunct instructors, often reaching proportions as high as 70% of all community college course work using adjunct instructors-- and moral plummets further among the existing faculty members.
In keeping with a trend to minimize faculty overhead, tenure, traditionally viewed a right of passage for the deserving professor, has been challenged. During the 70's, tenure was blamed for fostering an apathetic professor, often referred to as the 'dead weights' for the system. Tenure is said to put more fiscal demands on an institution, thereby, prohibiting the dismissal of a professor even when a department might close. Tenure quotas were engaged, resulting in a stifled promotion system for the young prospering professor. Many universities raised the quota system by increasing the standards for tenure, thus keeping young professors from obtaining tenure.

For currently tenured professors, the crisis continues. Tierney (1998) notes several approaches to faculty tenure dismissal including, reduction of contract terms, cessation of employment, and revocation of tenure. Reduction of pay was imposed upon many tenured professors under the auspices of a financial crunch at Southern University in Louisiana. When faculty contracts were reduced from 12 to 9 months, faculty pay was also reduced by 25%. The pay cut was not upheld by the courts as it was deemed that tenure protected faculty from pay cuts due to the financial crisis, back pay was ordered by the courts (Tierney, 1998). Similar budget cuts compelled the University of Southern California (USC) to close a science program and reduce faculty from a 12 to a 9 month contract. Faculty proceeded with a $40 million dollar law suit against the university. The case is pending in court, the university reinstated the faculty to their 12 months position. When the State University of New York, dismissed faculty based on financial crises, even tenured professors were vulnerable to dismissal in light of closing programs and departments. Morale plummeted across the institution and dismissal of tenured professors was reduced.

Alternative tenure strategies. Alternate strategies to managing the tenured faculty have been discussed throughout the past several decades with the University of Minnesota raising one of the more controversial threads of thought on the matter. When a campus was to be closed, every tenured professor was reassigned to other campuses rather than losing their jobs as might happen n the private sector when a company downsizes. Regents discussed the fact that tenure was held at the institutional level, therefore the professors were retained regardless of the closing of the local campus. It was proposed for discussion that perhaps tenure should be granted at the college level or the department level rather than at the university level. One rational for this is that if the program should close, the professor may well lose his or her job, but the university will function more efficiently (Tierney, 1998).

The level at which tenure is granted has raised much controversy within university settings. For instance, University of California met with much resistance from faculty and the Academic Senate when they attempted to close the Institute of Safety and Systems (ISSM) program which employed 14 faculty members. Faculty members were apprised that if they were not reassigned within a year's time they would receive a stipend, and need to find work elsewhere. Subsequently all faculty were placed within the University, but the process easily could have ended otherwise. Additional issues arising from the controversial handling of tenure involves, who places the tenured position and based on what criteria? Obviously, departmental problems may arise, all of which impact the faculty members range of autonomy. Regardless of the evaluation criteria used to make tenure decisions, it is essential that it be fairly and consistently administered (Werner & Bolino, 1997).

Post-tenure evaluations. Similarly, the evaluation of a post-tenure faculty has been discussed in the movement toward tenure reform. At the core of the issues is how to deal with unproductive tenured professors. One proposed

manner is to conduct a rigorous post-tenure review to examine who is, or is not, a productive member of faculty (Tierney, 1997). If the professor is found to be weak, will developmental strategies be conducted or will punitive actions be taken. Will they have grace periods or one, two, or three attempts to remediate the problem or will he or she have the status of tenure revoked? Until specific guidelines are determined, the concept of post-tenure evaluations should be discussed further from a multidimensional perspective considering the administrative, legal, and educational dimensions of the problem. Kansas State University had developed plans that could ultimately revoke tenure, but it has not been enacted, as yet.

Non-tenure and part-time faculty is also on the increase, which clearly jeopardizes job satisfaction and diminishes morale for existing professors, and in some situations, may exploit adjunct professors. Contractual agreements between full-time professors are now more common than before with a common issuance of one year, with dismissal at the end of the year for any number of reasons such as, budget constraints, program closing, or poor quality of teaching. Often a professor is hired for a specific task and the broader rational for professorships, research and service, do not enter into the job expectations.

Budgeting constraints reinforce the hiring of part-time faculty who can often teach class for as little as one-fifth of the cost of full time faculty who often receive costly benefit packages. From an administrative perspective, it makes budgeting sense as it increases flexibility in hiring decisions. From the faculty perspective, moral and a sense of university community is greatly reduced. Some have questioned the quality of teaching that is delivered by part-time faculty as they may not be invested into the university program as a whole. Gappa and Leslie (1993) note that only about 64% of full-time faculty hired in the last five years have tenure or are on the tenure track" (p. 2).

Academic mergers and tenure. Downsizing of the institution has called for creative solutions that may or may not benefit the educational program as a whole. Increasing budget cuts have forced policy makers and administrators to seek innovative ways to stay afloat. Academic mergers have evolved as a potential solution to straining economic times (Grassmuck, 1991; Kerline & Dunlap, 1993). Increasing productivity of the institution may require the merging of programs to extend survival of the institution itself as well as to improve institutional efficiency. However, ramifications of academic mergers include the dilemma of balancing productive outcomes while attempting to maintain institutional mission, including goals of equity, quality, and autonomy (McMillen, 1996).

Inherent in the process of implementing an academic merger is the philosophy that it may promote better interdisciplinary cooperation and collaboration among disciplines as well as to enhance the centralized administrative design. But often, newly merged academic disciplines battle over resource allocations, procedure, political power and overall collaborative efforts that must be implemented (Halter & Gullerud, 1995). Subsequently, morale plummets further as disgruntled faculty struggle to cope with formerly unrealized class sizes and promotion and tenure changes that may impact salary. Halter and Gullerud also note that faculty in free standing programs and long term mergers, more often than newly merged faculty, gain in autonomy. Similarly, it was reported that enhanced morale and job satisfaction occurred among faculty of free-standing programs versus merged programs.

Autonomy At The Institutional Level

For purposes of this paper, autonomy is discussed with a broader conceptualization than simply, academic freedom to encompass the First Amendment (Mooney, 1987). Raelin (1992), suggests three levels of autonomy: Strategic, administrative and operational. Strategic autonomy, according to Raelin's definition, refers to the freedom to make decisions for goals and policies that guide the organization. Planning tasks may involve faculty input, but overall, strategic autonomy refers to the philosophical values of the instructor. Similar values may be incorporated into the mission statement of an organizational entity such as preparation of students (a) to acquire advanced knowledge, (b) to pursue scholarly research, and (c) to serve society at large (Diner, 1995).

Administrative autonomy is such that it provides management with the freedom to address departmental tasks with a given unit of instruction as well as the overall instruction for the particular discipline. Management of the day to day functions of the institution should align with the same values expressed in the strategic outcomes functioning. Coordination between departments, colleges, universities and agencies, public and private, may be required. Hence, autonomy at the administrative level may be impacted by the same external forces that regulate institutional functioning such as, accrediting agency reviews, professional associations, and standards, community organization, and any other stakeholder in the higher education process.

Departmental faculty may, and should, be involved at some level in the administrative decision making when forming institutional policies and plans. Faculty involvement at the administrative level of autonomous functioning may be impacted in several ways. For instance, if collegiality is stressed as department expectations, the faculty member should be apprised of it so as to allow for faculty to meet administrative expectations, particularly in light of the impending performance appraisal that will assess that function (Bures & Tong, 1993).

Operational autonomy pertains to the actual teaching, research, service and work of the professor (Raelin, 1991). Academic work and fulfillment of course objectives require flexibility, imagination, creativity, and intellectual analysis. Daily demands on the professor's mind may be quite different from department to department depending on academic discipline as well as changing demands within each classroom section that is taught. For instance, a fine arts professor may need to choreograph a dance routine with incoming students, whereas an English professor may require students to discuss and contrast several author's style of writing in written form as part of a class final. Although attempts have evolved to develop standardized faculty evaluation forms (Snell & Mekies, 1992), the development, delivery, and evaluation of each subject is quite different. Therefore, faculty must be allocated a certain amount of autonomy based on non-standardized expectations and diversified course delivery with varying outcomes.

Overlap in levels of autonomy are obviously needed to address procedures and policy relevant to specific departments such as, curriculum content, research findings, available resources, class size, student outcome assessment, and so on. Participatory goal-setting, as borrowed from industry (Passmore, 1986), is reportedly successful in educational settings concerning merit review and salary allocation (Atamian & Ganguli, 1993; Elliott & Ryan, 1986). Because faculty performance expectations have traditionally been vague (Centra, 1996), specific task expectations of faculty are developed with a more flexible approach, often to be enhanced by the stakeholder's (faculty) participation on a department by department basis.

Autonomy in light of technology? Electronic learning now encompasses 20-80% of the educational learning environment. Multimedia text, graphics, photos, audio, animation and video, are now essential technological skills and tools of the trade that a professor must acquire if he or she is going to make the cut in the 21st century. Technological changes are occurring with great speed, so much so, that we are now a technology driven society (Passmore, 1986). A society that demands high tech learning within academic institutions, placing many professors, particularly those close to retirement, at a lose for the time, patience, and perhaps, the will learn a new delivery system for educating students. Keanne (1991) notes that faculty are often confused, overwhelmed and threatened by technological communication with students.

Schools, as we now know them, may become extinct in the future. The typical professor will no longer be assigned a classroom, but perhaps, need to produce and maintain his or her own selection of subject-categories on CD ROM. Student bodies may stretch across the globe by means of electronic delivery of lectures, use of chat rooms in cyberspace, and review of student's electronically transmitted homework. Given the ease of access that global communication has accomplished, what is to constrain class size? Hence the typical professor of the 21st century may take on an insurmountable amount of students as well as student homework workloads.

Professors must be retrained to address the innovative changes all the while, maintaining their current teaching, research, and community service job obligations. Autonomy among professors may indeed suffer at the hands of more recent trends in higher education for the 21st century. On behalf of global competition from faculty across the world, the aspiring institution may look to hire faculty members based on their electronic course package rather than years of service to the institution.

Time constraints may become a major hardship for the evolving professorship. Accountability has been a problem of much discussion in the past, and it may get worse. For instance, the professor may now be accountable to review e-mail from students that is forwarded anytime, day or night or weekends. Will the professor be expected to address each message as it arrives, or still maintain set office hours, and will the office hours be sufficient? How much of a message or reply, via e-mail, should be provided for students, and how long will it take the non-typing faculty member to respond? Then of course, there is the all time-consuming task of downloading student papers, how many students and how many papers? All of this preassumes that there are no computer cliches to result in downtime to delay work output, as will occur for distance learning students residing in extreme rural locations 3rd world countries.

Autonomy at the Personal Level

Beyond the definition of autonomy as 'freedom of speech' is the autonomy of decision making when interacting with students. What is to become of the method of communicating with students individually about class assignments, timelines of course presentations, adaptations for unexpected class changes, and overall professor's management of his or her student-teacher relationships? A standardized manner of processing an overwhelming amount of electronic submissions may emerge, further stifling the professor's ability toward autonomous delivery of course materials.

Considering the gap between the electronically challenged professor and the need for electronically proficient faculty members, managers or administrators must be quick to assemble tolerant and timely training programs for existing faculty members. Given the reticence of the majority of any employees to experience change, job satisfaction may once again be jeopardized as frustrations with hardware, software and overall technological training needs emerge. Additionally, as with all change processes, emotionally charged elements of the change process need to be addressed. Tension and resistance may surface and prolong the training process (Dickson, 1993), hence the entire change process requires astute, dynamic, and innovative leadership to fulfill technological training needs.

One overall theme, expressed by many faculty members, is the sense of 'loss of control' in personal student-teacher contact when using electronically submitted communication. Given the rapid speed of technological advancements, continuing education departments must offer simplistic, but relevant, training programs for faculty. Course content must address their personal concerns as well as teach high-tech skills, thus satisfying both intellectual and emotional needs to facilitate the change process. Although it was noted in 1995, that only 25% of all institutions revised plans to use the world-wide-web for delivery of institutional courses, current numbers of institutions offering distance learning programs has significantly increased.

Summary

While the above discussion is not all inclusive of environmental forces that impact faculty autonomy, the range of issues presented was extensive. Because autonomy was traditionally viewed as an inherent benefit or privilege extended to worthy faculty members, administrative innovations that modify, alter, or in some cases, jeopardize the faculty member's perceived autonomy on the job, has resulted in reduced moral and overall job dissatisfaction. Issues or trends in higher education were explored to illustrate the multidimensional perspective of faculty autonomy that have been impacted by constrained budgets on one hand, and the need for fast-paced technological changes on the other hand. There is no doubt, that the up and coming faculty member of the 21st century will come to know the field of professorship under a different light than his or her predecessors. The following section offers suggestions for professional development programs to prepare faculty to be proficient, technologically prepared, providers of higher education in the 21st century while simultaneously revitalizing a sense of autonomy and job satisfaction among faculty.

Recommendations

Given the wide range of issues that impact faculty autonomy and job satisfaction, a diverse range of professional development options should be easily accessible to accommodate faculty needs (Guskin, 1994; Millis, 1994). As related above, suggestions to enhance a sense of autonomy in the workplace will be provided. Second, job dissatisfaction was related to current budget constraints, administrative policy changes (particularly toward hiring, promoting, and tenure granting policies), which will be addressed here. Finally, faculty training needs regarding hi-tech skills and tools for instructional advancement will be discussed.

Autonomy And Belonging. One of the first steps in solving any problem is identification of the problem. It is not unusual for faculty to vent frustrating statements about the workplace in a generalized manner. When this occurs, an overall sense of frustration is acknowledged without true identification of the problem, thus focus remains on the problem rather than the solution. Subsequently, frustration builds and tension within a department can escalate, thereby reducing productivity and overall sense of belonging. The following recommendations may help enhance a sense of belonging and active participation in departmental decisions. While some suggestions may appear elementary, each one can enhance intra-department and inter-department interactions that may enhance a sense of belonging among faculty members (Ferrara, 1996). The underlying theme here is to open lines of communication which acknowledges and encourages faculty initiatives.

1. Hold a faculty social event, if possible, at least once a month on an informal basis. By allowing the faculty to meet outside of the every-day demands of the department, more relaxed attitudes can render more positive approaches to identifying sources of departmental frustration.

2. An anonymous faculty suggestion box could be placed in a conspicuous place within the department and the department chair might encourage faculty to use it. Because some faculty may be reticent to come forward in a face-to-face meeting, valuable insight and/or suggestions may be lost. Anonymity must be assured.

3. An informal peer review group could be organized to encourage socialization of faculty members as well as to provide a forum for them to enhance a sense of collegiality as they share a common professional activity.

4. A department newsletter could be initiated with rotating editors. Even small sized departments (five or less faculty) have expressed a lack of knowledge about other faculty member's research interests or unique instructional techniques.

5. Brown bag lunches could be offered to minimize additional time requirements for interactive activities. Perhaps one faculty member each month can demonstrate his or her current interest area.

6. Record keeping strategies might be shared among faculty members. Often, one or more faculty members have initiated forms or strategies that can enhance the tracking of student work, attendance, or communications, thereby simplify a workload for all while enhancing a cooperative work setting.

Hiring and Tenure Practices

7. If a new faculty policy is under consideration for implementation, program planning should be openly discussed with faculty at the initial phase of planning. More than the policy itself, may be the resentment realized if potential policy changes are kept hidden from the designated faculty. Direct line supervisors gain tremendously when a trust relationship is built between administrator/department chair and faculty member.

8. Once a policy is instated, it should be accessible for faculty and openly discussed within individual departments. Open discussions can alleviate unwarranted fears and concerns from faculty as well as facilitate individual faculty member's career decisions if properly informed of faculty expectations. For instance, if a department requires that one professional journal article will be published by faculty each year versus another department that might expect three published articles in a year. If faculty performance appraisal is based on the number of publications, this fact should be visibly published in faculty policy manuals.

9. For experienced and tenured faculty members, confidence in job performance may be expected. However, a more traditional value system toward tenure or autonomous functioning may drive senior faculty opinions toward policy changes. Therefore, both emotional and behavioral reactions may require more advanced, frequent, or intense cooperative meetings.

10. For the novice faculty member, policy manuals should be specific in terms of performance expectations and promotion and tenure requirements. Perhaps, because autonomy on the job has not been readily viewed as an expected job benefit, the incoming faculty members will not challenge new policy dictates or find them as demoralizing as senior faculty members may. Similarly, the novice faculty member may need to make career decisions based on policy manual content and job requirements, therefore, ambiguous terms seriously impact incoming academians career decisions.

11. Individual department faculty requirements should also be in written documentation. If specific requirements are part of faculty's performance appraisal, faculty has a right to know exactly what is expected of him or her.

12. Faculty mentor programs can enhance both feelings of autonomy as well as increase a sense of belonging among faculty members.

Technological Training Needs

13. Typing expertise: Some faculty may need basic training in keyboard operations. Obviously, the more astute a professor is in terms of typing facility, the less intimidated he or she may be in attempting innovative use of computer assisted instruction in the classroom.

14. Electronic transmission operations-e-mail, file uploads, downloads and transfers can be a great enhancement to the daily tasks of the professorship. However, if no training or practice time is allotted to faculty prior to implementation of the electronic system or network, tremendous frustration and demoralization can occur. Training programs or tutorials on electronic communications must be conducted in a user friendly manner with plenty of individualized learning and practice sessions included. Avoid public forums where a faculty member, who ordinarily is proficient in his or her field, suddenly is faced with humiliation under peer pressure to master the cyberspace connection.

15. Organizational training is essential to help faculty organize files systems to maintain student files, course related f files, conference scheduling, journal publications, and so on. Perhaps faculty members that are more proficient in software management systems can provide a session for the non-learned colleagues.

16. Time management under cyberspace connection pressure. If projections for global course enrollments approach anticipated figures (500 and over), faculty will require training on how to manage student grading, assignment review, and general record keeping. Department workloads may require regular e-mail check-ins on a regular basis. Faculty must decide how much of a response is sufficient when communicating with students via e-mail as well as what time of day or night is most convenient for the faculty member to undertake such a tasks. For instance, downloading student files can take several minutes per student. If downloaded at home, paper and toner supplies quickly disappear. Who absorbs the cost?

17. Internet services and data base searching in cyberspace can be heaven or h..l. Literature reviews can easily be accomplished now that in-home computers allow for almost instantaneous downloading of full-text articles or reference lists. For the proficient computer user it could be a charm, but for the fumbling non-technologically oriented academian, cyberspace becomes a nightmare. Again, tutorial use or peer mentoring can be of help. Faculty meetings can be used as a forum for technological instruction even if only one small lesson per meeting is provided.

18. Professional networking and chat boxes can enhance faculty's advancement on technical skills, but again accessing such files must be rehearsed. The wealth of information that can be obtained from specific web addresses should be shared among faculty to enhance networking access.

19. Finally, but far from least frustrating is the development of instructional modules on CD ROM. Besides the subject content or modules to include on the CD ROM, personal attributes of the instructor could dictate student enrollment (Long & Sparks, 1997). For instance, articulation, speaking voice (if audio is included), personal appearance on CD ROM, and numerous other theatrical considerations, never before so scrutinized, must now be considered.

References

Altbach, P. G. (1995). Problems and possibilities: The US academic profession. Studies in Higher Education, 20(1), 27-45.

Atamian, R., & Ganguli, G. (1993). Teacher popularity and teaching effectiveness: Viewpoint of accounting students. Journal of Education for Business, 68(3), 163-170.

Boer, E. L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boise State to publish faculty evaluations. (1994). Academe, 80(4), 7-9.

Boyer, E. L., Altbach, P. G., & Whitelaw, M. J. (1994). The academic profession: An international perspective. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement of Teaching.

Buckley, Jr. Wm. F. (1995). Academic license. National Review, 47(7), 774-776.

Bures, A. L., & Tong, H.-M. (1993). Assessing finance faculty evaluation systems. A national survey. Financial Practice & Education, 3(2), 141-145.

Centra, J. A. (1996). Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dickson, M. (1993). Initial opposition—Won't portfolio assessment take away teacher autonomy? East Lansing, MI: Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 357 384).

Diner, S. J. (1985). Faculty and its discontents. Educational Record, 66(Win), 60-62.

Elliott S.M., & Ryan, M. E. (1986). A market and merit plan for faculty salary increases. College Teaching, 34(Fall), 124-134.

Feldman, K. A. (1986). The perceived instructor effectiveness of college teachers as related to their personality and attitude in all characteristics: A review and synthesis. Research in Higher Education, 24(2), 139-213.

Ferrara, F. F. (1996). Interagency Communication Measure (ICM): A survey instrument to enhance interagency collaboration. The Clinical Supervisor, 14, 175-187.

Ferrara, F. F. (1994). University promotion and tenure: A content analysis of performance criteria. Paper presented at the Florida Educational Research Association, Tampa, FL.

Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Grassmuck, K. (1991). More small colleges merge with larger ones, but some find the process can be painful. Chronicle of Higher Education, September, 18, A1.

Greenberg, M. (1993). Accounting for faculty member's time. Chronicle of Higher Education, October, 20(9), PA68.

Guskin, A. E. (1994). Restructuring the role of faculty. Change, 26(5), 16-26.

Halter, A., & Gullerud, E. (1995). Academic mergers in social work programs: Autonomy or disharmony. Journal of Social Work Education, 31(2), 269-281.

Keane, D. R. (1991). The inadequacy of recent research on computer-assisted instructin. Academic Medicine, 66(8), 444-448.

Kerlin, S. & Dunlap, D. (1993). For richer, for poorer: Faculty morale in periods of austerity and retrenchment. Journal of Higher Education, 64(3), 312-321.

Layzell. (1992). Tight budgets demand studies of faculty productivity. Chronicle of Higher Education, 38(24), B2-4

Leas T. (1991). Higher education, the courts and the 'Doctrine' of Academic Absenteeism'. Journal of Law and Education, 20(2), 135-165.

Levine, A., & Nidiffer, J. (1993). Faculty Productivity: A re-examination of current attitudes and actions. Boston, MA: Institute of Educational Management, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Licata, C. M., & Andrew, H. A. (1990). The status of tenured faculty evaluation in the community college. Community College Review, 18(3), 42-51.

Long, J. D., & Sparks, W. L. (1997). Behaviors perceived as facilitating or inhibiting the learning process. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 24(3), 196-202.

Massy, W. F., & Zemsky, R. (1992). Philadelphia, PA: Pew Higher Education Program.

McMillen, L. (1991). University of Rochester plans to merge two colleges and trim graduate programs. Chronicle of Higher Education, (March 20), 33.

McPherson, M. S. (1994). Public purpose and public accountability in liberal education. New Directions for Higher Education, 85(1), 83-93.

Millis Barbara, J. (1994). Faculty development in the 1990s: What it is and why we can't wait. Journal of Counseling & Development, 72(5), 454-465.

Mooney, C. J. (1987). Newest threats to academic freedom may come from faculty members, scholars tell AAUP. Chronicle of Higher Education, 34(28), A15-16.

Mooney, C. J. (1991). Stanford unveils plan designed to evaluate status of teaching. Chronicle of Higher Education, 37(26), A215-216.

Mooney, C. J. (1992). Critics within and without academe assail professors at research universities. Chronicle of Higher Education, 39(10), A17-20.

Osborne, L., & Purkey, W. W. (1995). A model faculty peer review process for counselor education programs. Journal of Counseling & Development, July/August, 34-38.

Passmore, W. (1988). Designing effective organizations. New York: J. P. Wiley & Sons.

Pack, W. (1997, June 21). Judge backs professors, rules tenure protects pay. State Times/Morning Advocate.

Pollicino, E. A. (1996). Faculty satisfaction with institutional support as a complex concept: Collegiality, workload, autonomy. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No ED 394 428. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Raelin, J. A. (1986). The clash of cultures: Managers and professionals. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Raelin, J. A. (1991). Academic freedom and control. College Teaching, 39(1), 26-31.

Schlesinger, P. F. (1996). Teaching and evaluation in an integrated curriculum. Journal of Management Education, 20(4), 479-500.

Snell, J. C., & Mekies, S. (1992). Snell educator effectiveness index: An instrument for faculty evaluation by students. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 19(4), 286-291.

The 21st Century Electronic Learning Institute. (1997). Some thoughts about what the 21st century electronic learning institution will look like. [on line] Available: http://home.navisoft.com/edg/century.htm.

Tierney, W. G. (1997). Academic community and post-tenure review. Academe, 83(3), 23-25.

Tierney, W. G. (1998). Leveling tenure. American Behavioral Scientist, 41(5), 627-638.

United Nations Educational, Science, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. (1992). (Proceedings of the International Conference). Sinaia, Romania: European Center for Higher Education.

Virginia Commission on the University of the Twenty-First Century. (1989). (ERIC Reproduction Service Report No. HE 027 210). East Lansing, MI: Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Wachman, M. (1994). The end of the Ivory tower; Students, administration and community. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 368 279). East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Werner, J. M., & Bolino, M. C. (1997). Explaining US Courts of Appeals decisions involving performance appraisal: Accuracy, fairness, and validation. Personnel Psychology, 50(1), 24-27.

Wood, F. (1990). Factors influencing research performance of university academic staff. Higher Education, 19(1), 81-100.